

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/553,097	KING ET AL.
	Examiner IQBAL H. CHOWDHURY	Art Unit 1652

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) IQBAL H. CHOWDHURY.

(3) Paul J. White.

(2) Rebecca Prouty.

(4) Carol Weber.

Date of Interview: 20 May 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 30-45.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yes (Dillon et al.).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: There was an interview with the applicants representatives regarding rejections under 35 U.S.C.112 1st, on written description and scope of enablement issues, and rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Applicants argue that the rejection under 102 should not be under 102(b) but rather 102(e). The Examiner agreed that there was a typographical error, which should have been 102(e) based on the analysis of the prior art. Applicants also stated that they will limit the oxygen-sensitive iron hydrogenase structural feature, i.e. derived from certain organism, such that 112 issues could be overcome.